www.historymarg.com

Journal of Alternative Perspectives in the Social Sciences (2010) Vol 2, No 1,430-445

Gandhi, Civilization, Non-Violence and Obama

Tamer Söyler, Humboldt University

Abstract: *How should we understand Gandhi's commitment to non-violence? After discussing and refuting the idea that Gandhi's conception of non-violence can be treated merely as a method to stand up to aggression, its embedment in a concept of true civilization is examined. It is argued that the important nuances between the definitions of civilization in the Gujarati and the English versions of Gandhi's seminal work Hind Swaraj (1909) reveal Gandhi's conception of civilization.*

1. Introduction

The year 2009 has marked the 140th birthday of Mahatma Gandhi (1869-1948). World leaders have honored Gandhi in their public speeches and messages throughout the year. For example, U.S. President Barack Hussein Obama has showed his respect for Gandhi's contribution to a philosophy of non-violent struggle as a key to facing hostile forces threatening the modern world. This would have sounded all good if only we had not noted the irony of Obama's strong belief in the concept of 'just war' which Gandhi perhaps could have not stood up to more. In his Nobel 'Peace' Prize acceptance speech[i], Obama has declared to the world that although he has not seen anything weak, passive and naive in the creed and live of Gandhi, because of the fact that a non-violent movement could not have halted Hitler's armies, sometimes war has proved to be necessary. In other words, while seemingly acknowledging the legacy of Gandhi, Obama has claimed to go beyond Gandhi's philosophy and practice of non-violence by stating that as the President of the U.S., he faces the world as it is, therefore, in his view, the use of force is necessary and morally justified. For one obvious reason, this statement is almost an oxymoron which we can hope Obama has carefully crafted possibly to reveal and share his paradox of using war as a mean to reach the peace end: Gandhi's philosophy requires full commitment to the principle that

www.historymarg.com

violence should be avoided no matter what[ii]. What prevents Obama and his talented speechwriters finding a remedy for this dissonance[iii] is the simple fact that there cannot be a reasonable way to pass Gandhi's name along while, for example, sending more troops to Afghanistan. One good solution is to isolate Gandhi's concept of non-violence from that of 'true civilization', a common trick that politicians tend to use to get around the problem of using contradictory concepts. For make no mistake: 'True civilization' and non-violence are inextricably intertwined components of the Gandhian Thought. Therefore, without a true understanding of Gandhi's definition of civilization, it is not possible to refer to his conception of non-violence free of contradictions. In the following, by elaborating on the important nuances between the definitions of civilization in the Gujarati and the English versions of Gandhi's seminal work *Hind Swaraj (1909)*[iv], I will speculate on what Gandhi might have meant by civilization and explain its relevance to non-violence. Through this, I aim to show that if Obama has a problem, that is not one of expression but it derives from the structures of modern civilization which Gandhi criticizes the most.

2. Defining Civilization

Gandhi's idea and practice of non-violent struggle is a fundamental notion of his worldview and it is not possible to treat his conception of non-violence by reducing it to a merely passive–aggressive method to resist despotism. First of all, as Gandhi states repeatedly, there is nothing 'passive' about *Ahimsa*[v]. It is in fact one of the strongest ways to actively resist aggression. The adjective 'passive' in that sense is a misnomer (CWMG 22: 221)[vi]. Secondly, according to Gandhi, non-violence is more than a method; it determines the essential and existential values of a civilization. Therefore, to make sense of Gandhi's commitment to non-violence, we need to understand what Gandhi means by 'true civilization'. Because of the fact that Gandhi had always kept himself to his seminal work *Hind Swaraj*, the most appropriate place to start discussing his

www.historymarg.com

conception of civilization is, I argue, this modest but influential booklet.

Although *Hind Swaraj* has always been referred to as the embodiment of Gandhi's critique of modernity, it will not be wrong to state that what Gandhi means by 'civilization' in *Hind Swaraj* has never been adequately examined. There are several reasons for this odd situation and one reasonable explanation is that since Gandhi introduces varying meanings of civilization on different occasions, it is difficult to give an exhaustive definition of the concept. Therefore, given the hardship of the task, I will limit myself to the examination of the nuances between Gandhi's definitions of the term 'true civilization' in the English and the Gujarati editions of *Hind Swaraj*. What underlies this focus is my assumption that interpreting those differences can lead us to an accurate grasp of Gandhi's conception of civilization. One of the main distinctions between the Gujarati and English editions of *Hind Swaraj* is that while in the former Gandhi uses the Gujarati words 'sudharo' and 'kudharo' in a dialectical manner, the word 'kudharo', thus, the dialectical context is missing in the latter [vii]. Accordingly, in the following, I will elaborate on what big of a difference one missing word can make in our efforts to understand Gandhi's understanding of civilization.

3. Two Definitions of Civilization

Gandhi states quite clearly that when he uses the Gujarati word 'sudharo', which generally has been used to refer to the word 'civilization', he actually regards a broader meaning which should read as: 'a good way of life' (CWMG 12: 44). In this particular case, Gandhi does not elaborate further on what he means either by 'civilization', 'a good way of life' or 'sudharo'. Nonetheless, elsewhere, in *Hind Swaraj*, Gandhi takes the opportunity to elaborate on his understanding of civilization:

> "*civilization* is that mode of conduct which points out to man [human beings] the path of duty. Performance of duty and observance of morality are convertible terms. To observe morality is to attain mastery over our mind

www.historymarg.com

> and our passions. So doing, we know ourselves" (CWMG 10: 279).

Reading the earlier definition with the latter guides us in our intention to conceptualize in what context Gandhi uses the terms 'civilization', 'a good way of life' and 'sudharo'. Gandhi's introduction of the concept 'duty' bears a special importance not only because 'duty' has a special meaning for Gandhi; it also has a unique place in the Indian tradition bearing a variety of meanings. This calls for the need to contextualize the meaning of duty within the framework of 'purusharthas' (Parel 2006).

'Purushartha' can refer to any of the four aims of life: 'dharma', 'artha', 'kama' and 'moksha' (ibid.: 5). Amongst these four, 'dharma' has a special place as it embodies three core meanings: religion, ethics and duty. According to Anthony Parel, "dharma in the sense of duty was the foundation of classical Indian social philosophy. The stability of the social order depended on the sense of duty with which members of society carried out their activities" (ibid.: 87). In the light of this information, it is possible to read Gandhi's definition of civilization as follows: A *civilization* is a *true civilization* only if it offers *a good way of life*; *a good way of life* is possible only if the *social order* is maintained within the society; *social order* can only be possible if people dedicate themselves to *dharma*. Therefore, according to Gandhi, a *true civilization* could be possible only if people live *religious*, *ethical* and *dutiful* lives[viii].

It is by no means difficult to identify passages supporting this interpretation in Gandhi's collective works; indeed, to the point that what I am discussing here may look like new wine in old bottles. Hence, I will go one step further and ask this question: what if the original Gujarati text was translated differently? Would it be then possible for us to read Gandhi's definition of civilization rather differently? I will try to answer this question in the next section.

4. Reform as a Process of Change

One of the contemporary representatives of the Gujarati literature, Sitanshu Yashaschandra (2003), argues that it is possible to translate some parts of the original

www.historymarg.com

Gujarati text differently into English. Yashaschandra puts the emphasis on the Gujarati words 'sudharo' and 'kudharo' and he identifies at least two interesting points with Gandhi's own translation:
Firstly, since Gandhi translates the word 'sudharo' as 'a good way of life', 'kudharo' should mean 'a bad way of life' (CWMG 10: 279). As already mentioned, Gandhi uses the two words as opposing concepts in the Gujarati version of *Hind Swaraj*. Nevertheless, when Gandhi translates the text into English, he leaves 'kudharo' out and uses 'sudharo' alone. By doing so, Gandhi actually brings a completely different meaning to the text. Secondly, when 'sudharo' and 'kudharo' are considered to be operating in a dialectical manner, they could be translated as 'a change for the better' and 'a change for the worse' as well (Yashaschandra 2003: 605). When we highlight the relevant part in *Hind Swaraj* where Gandhi refers to his particular conception of civilization, and read it with Yashaschandra's translation, the difference in meaning will be apparent to the reader. Gandhi's own translation reads:

> "It is not due to any peculiar fault of the English people, but the condition is due to modern civilization. It is a civilization only in name. Under it the nations of Europe are becoming degraded and ruined day by day" (CWMG 10: 258).

See the difference with Yashaschandra's translation:

> "It is not due to any peculiar fault of the English people, but it is due to **the fault of their -or rather Europe's- reforms [sudharo]. Those changes for the better are [in reality] changes for the worse [kudharo].** Under it the people of Europe are being ruined" (Yashaschandra 2003: 605).

While I think that the difference can lead the reader to some very interesting conclusions, it is also possible to treat this nuance as negligible. For example, keeping the principle of remaining loyal to Gandhi's own translation, Parel argues that putting too much emphasis on the concepts 'sudharo' and 'kudharo' may actually mislead the reader[ix] because of the point that 'sudharo' and 'kudharo' are not the only

www.historymarg.com

relevant concepts in the definition of civilization. This view encourages the reader to work mainly with the concept 'purushartha' and interpret the concepts 'sudharo' and 'kudharo' accordingly. Consequently, the main message of the passage will read as the inconsistency of colonialism with the teachings of Christianity (Parel 2007: 115). Parel draws on the below passage from *Hind Swaraj* to support this argument:

> "You, English, who have come to India are not good specimens of the English nation, nor can we, almost half-Anglicized Indians, be considered good specimens of the real Indian nation. If the English nation were to know all you have done, it would oppose many of your actions. The mass of the Indians have had few dealings with you. **If you will abandon your so-called civilization and search into your own scriptures, you will find that our demands are just.** Only on condition of our demands being fully satisfied may you remain in India; and if you remain under those conditions, we shall learn several things from you and you will learn many from us. So doing we shall benefit each other and the world. But that will happen only when the root of our relationship is sunk in a religious soil" (CWMG 10: 308).

Although I agree with Parel on this point, in my assessment, this particular interpretation does not contradict or challenge the meaning I derive from Yashaschandra's translation. In fact, shedding some light on the concepts of 'sudharo' and 'kudharo', on the contrary, does clarify and strengthen Gandhi's core message. When we read the three texts together, the underlying message becomes apparent:

> **Gandhi's own translation reads:** "It is not due to any peculiar fault of the English people, but the condition is due to **modern civilization**. It is a civilization only in name. Under it the nations of Europe are becoming degraded and ruined day by day" (CWMG 10: 258).

www.historymarg.com

> **Yashaschandra's translation reads:** "It is not due to any peculiar fault of the English people, but it is due to the **fault of their -or rather Europe's- reforms [sudharo].** Those changes for the better are [in reality] changes for the worse [kudharo]. Under it the people of Europe are being ruined" (Yashaschandra 2003: 605).
>
> **The relevant part from *Hind Swaraj* reads**: "If you will abandon your so-called civilization **[if you will abandon the reform (*kudharo* in the form of *sudharo*)]** and search into your own scriptures **[go back to the original meaning before the reform],** you will find that our demands are just" (CWMG 10: 308).

The 'reform', as Yashaschandra's translation suggests, has not led the so-called Western World to 'true civilization'. Although this 'reform' had the potential to lead its people to a religious, ethical and dutiful life, in the end, it has created such institutions through which miseries such as colonialism have been brought to the world. In that sense, we can conclude that the main nuance between the Gujarati and the English definitions of civilization in *Hind Swaraj* renders thusly: while in Yashaschandra's translation there is an emphasis on both the processes of change which the Western civilization had experienced, and the static structures which had occurred as a consequence of this transformation, Gandhi's English translation gives the impression that the focus is merely on the static structures. In my opinion, this new reading makes it clear that Gandhi does not "refer to any static, eternal structure of social organization, whether Indian or European. He is rather analyzing two processes of change, 'sudharo' and 'kudharo'. He explains how a certain process of change is better and preferable to another" (Yashaschandra 2003: 606). To rephrase what I have just argued in the framework of 'purushartha': with the rise of modernity, Gandhi thinks that there has been a shift in the balance between the four aims of life favorable to 'artha' and 'kama', discrediting 'moksha' and 'dharma'. In other words, Gandhi's main problem is with this existential change in people's attitude towards life. His critique of modernity, therefore, puts the emphasis on 'duty' with the aim to balance the four aims of life in a traditional

www.historymarg.com

manner. Bluntly put, Gandhi concludes that modern civilization has caused a distortion in people's perception of life and time has come for all to get rid of this dillusion to have a more humane life.

5. Abandoning 'The Reform'

Because Gandhi's critique is directed to the great discourses of modernity by its persistent references to the so-called premodern traditions of the world, it does not imply that he is uncritically premodern or nostalgically recreating an atavistic past in reactionary terms. "Rather, his criticism of modernity takes care to note that many of its excesses are due to a detrimental devaluation of more 'traditional' ways" and his main concern is to get tradition back into the game of dialectics (Abraham 2007: 150). This principle lies at the core of his critique of modernity and therefore, any attempt to interpret Gandhian Thought has to take this fundamental principle into consideration. In that sense, although it would be indeed very interesting to speculate on Gandhi's understanding of the intellectual roots of modernity (e.g. Uberoi 2002), because of the fact that Gandhi prefers rather to concentrate on its "character and effects" (Terchek 2006: 78), it is not necessary to discuss which historical incidents Gandhi specifically relates this transformation to. For the very same reason, in this essay, I have avoided the very popular approach of discussing Gandhi's ideas in tandem with some of the Western sources. Although I strongly believe that a comparative framework derives its legitimacy from the fact that in a rapidly globalizing world it makes much more sense to emphasize what is shared by ideas that are authored in different cultures, rather than listing their differences, owing to the fact that my readings of such comparative studies so far have disappointed me enormously for quite a few reasons, I have not labored over a similar effort in this essay. Before I come to the conclusion, I will open a parenthesis to write a few more lines on this topic.

It is true that in his writings and speeches, Gandhi often encourages the readers and his audience to study other thoughts in comparison which put forward similar criticisms of modernity. But we must note that, it is indeed

www.historymarg.com

two different things to read Gandhi in tandem with some other so-called Western and non-Western sources, and to get into a debate of how much Gandhi is indebted to the Indian tradition and how much to the others. I must admit that a discussion like this is tempting and I was trapped in such an irrelevant vocation for quite some time (e.g. Söyler 2009a)[x]. Take it as a confession, I feel the necessity to state here loud and clear that as far as my own comparative readings are concerned, I am consciously avoiding to recruit myself to, and suggesting others doing the same, mainly two strands of thought.

The first approach at its extreme can be named 'occidentalist' (Buruma & Margalit 2004)[xi]. If the ideas which are presented in this framework speak with a softer tone, it would be more proper for us to categorize them under the label 'universalist' (Dallmayr 1989). Neither of the terms are my inventions, I use them in a specific context, perhaps distorting their original meanings. Even so, by these terms, I specifically refer to one particular line of thought which tends to argue that the non-Western critiques of the Western modernity, in fact, derive their ideas from Western sources. Since my specific concern is to highlight Gandhi's definition of *Hind Swaraj* in this essay, this will be a proper place to give Rudolph and Rudolph's (2006) remarks on *Hind Swaraj* as a self-explanatory case for the readers. Although Rudolph and Rudolph give some credit to Gandhi by examining his thought through a postmodern framework, they do argue that the foreword of the 1909 edition of *Hind Swaraj* and the 1910 preface "make it clear" that Gandhi perceived himself as "part of a larger movement of European Thought"; he "learned from and identified with Europeans who doubted, dissented, and resisted empire and modernity"; and "it was they who motivated and helped him to formulate his critique of modern civilization and to articulate his alternative to it" (ibid.:17). In other words, Rudolph and Rudolph, and many others (e.g. Adams and Dyson 2003) tend to see Gandhi's critique of modernity through 'ethico-moral' glasses (Dadhich 1993) and arrive at a conclusion that Gandhi is a synthesizer at his best and an eclectic at worst. On the other hand, the second position which we can refer to as 'contextual' or 'exclusivist' or so-called scientific, tends to treat *Hind Swaraj* as a time-bound, strategic document,

www.historymarg.com

whose interpretation would be confined to the political circumstances under which it was written (e.g. Rothermund quoted in Rudolph and Rudolph 2006). It seems to me that this approach is not less problematic than the former, and it spends an unnecessarily large amount of time and energy on bending over backwards to turn the 'simplicity' of the Gandhian discourse into something 'sophisticated' in an apologetic manner.

I think, both approaches alienate Gandhi from his own work. It is indeed still interesting to read those studies, but while doing so, I really do not know about whom the reader will learn the most: Gandhi or the authors? What these two lines of thought seem to be bothered by the most and try to bypass, in fact, provides the most solid grounds for our study of Gandhi's critique of modernity. The simplicity of the Gandhian discourse is not an obstacle but a facilitator. Just like non-violence is an existential principle for Gandhi so is simplicity (Söyler, 2009b). In other words, very clearly and boldly, Gandhi does not need to be contextualized, Westernized or 'even' Indianized. Just like there is nothing 'passive' about *Ahimsa*, there is nothing 'naive' about the Gandhian Thought either. This brings me to my conclusion.

6. Conclusion

A true understanding of the Gandhian practice and thought of non-violence requires internalizing Gandhi's definition of civilization. A close examination of the English and the Gujarati editions of *Hind Swaraj* reveal that what Gandhi refers to by 'civilization' and 'true civilization' is a process of change which either can generate power or exterminate it. In that sense, while Gandhi links the change in the form of 'sudharo' to sources of strength; he conversely discusses how all power has to be given up when one accepts the other process of change, 'kudharo'. A perfect example of a change which generates power [sudharo] is *Satyagraha*. The core principle of *Satyagraha* is holding on to truth, performing love-force or soul-force, presenting firmness in a good cause to create a change for better (CWMG 20: 39; 34: 93). On the other hand, the reform which

www.historymarg.com

Western civilization has experienced and through which it has lost its purity [power], is a good example for a change for the worse [kudharo]. Therefore, as Yashaschandra (2003) argues, Gandhi's critique of modernity is not interested in static structures of a civilization per se, whether Indian or European. Speaking in terms of purusharthas, what Gandhi understands from this process of change is a fundamental shift of emphasis from moksha and dharma to artha and kama (Parel, 2006). To put it bluntly, if we draw an existential framework out of the theory of purusharthas by keeping Gandhi's definition of civilization in mind, it will give us a fair understanding of one's view of life through which we can perhaps determine whether or not this particular view has anything to do with that of Gandhi.

The thread leads us, inexorably, to Obama, who apparently is convinced that it makes sense to refer to Gandhi right before starting to discuss how just his war is in Afghanistan. I think we do not need any existential framework or whatsoever to state clearly that Obama's references to Gandhi have nothing to do with the Gandhian Thought [xii] . We can never emphasize enough: in the Gandhian framework, non-violence is not meant to be a political tactic or strategy but a core principle which dominates all aspects of life. Hence, there is absolutely no room for selective violence in Gandhi's view. Although by referring to Gandhi's comments on the Jewish resistance to the Hitler regime[xiii] in a subtle and tricky way, Obama tries to make grounds for a legitimate use of force in the name of 'just war' for the Afghan case, his argumentation is destined to fail. Nevertheless, equating the alliance against the Third Reich with that of Afghan invasion, Obama goes beyond our wildest imagination and shadows our hopes for a non-violent world. Unlike Gandhi, the U.S. president does not hesitate to pretend to posses 'the truth' about good and evil. By declaring his conviction that evil literally does exist in the world, he proclaims to have a legitimate position to determine who should be punished and who spared. We must give Obama some credit since he comes close to Gandhi with his discussion of evil, with a nuance though: It is true that Gandhi also believes that evil exists in the world, but for Gandhi what is defined as evil is actually to hold a position which claims to know the absolute truth regarding

www.historymarg.com

the nature of goodness. The beauty of the simplicity[xiv] of the Gandhian discourse is that it clearly declares without bearing any doubt that a violent life is at war with itself. Given the fact that Obama's reference to Gandhi is utterly contradictory, I cannot stop myself from asking this question: Why does Obama feel the need to talk about Gandhi?

One explanation is that since the year 2009 has marked the 100th anniversary of *Hind Swaraj* and 140th anniversary of the birthday of Gandhi, world leaders must have felt obliged to mention Gandhi's name. In Obama's case, his admiration of Martin Luther King (1929-68) and King's glorification of Gandhian non-violent struggle must have played an additional role. But, there is certainly more to Obama's persistent references to Gandhi than his appreciation. In my opinion, it cannot be a coincidence that Obama has developed a habit of introducing ambivalent and contradictory points in his speeches. The ambivalence which dominates Obama's statements is a result of his strategy for survival. While it is obvious even for the most ethnocentric arrogant minds that with the rise of the Global South[xv] it is not possible anymore for anyone to stick to the good old fashioned modern discourses, one should expect from Obama, a master of rhetoric, to reflect on the global shifts in power structures in his remarks. Colluding with the challenge of the rise of the Global South forces Obama to acknowledge the reality of alternative modernities. Although I personally take, for example, Shakira[xvi] more serious than Obama when she states that she has been following Gandhi's principles on social change, there is yet a positive aspect of Obama's heroic effort to melt contradictory concepts under one pot: acknowledging the co-existence of modernity and alternative modernities has the potential to fuel the dynamic tension between those views and create unique approaches which can contribute to our understanding of the world and hopefully our efforts for social change towards a peaceful world.

www.historymarg.com

References

Abraham, S. (2007) *Identity, ethics, and nonviolence in postcolonial theory: a Rahnerian theological assessment*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Adams, I. and Dyson R. W. (2003) *Fifty Major Political Thinkers*. New York: Routledge.

Bondurant, J. V. (1965) *Conquest of violence: the Gandhian philosophy of conflict* [Rev. ed.]. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Buruma, I. and Margalit, A. (2004) *Occidentalism: a short history of anti-Westernism*. London: Atlantic.

Chant, S. H. and Cathy Mcllwaine (2009) *Geographies of development in the 21st century: an introduction to the Global South*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Dadhich, N. (1993) *Gandhi and Existentialism*. Jaipur, India: Rawat.

Dallmayr, F. R. (1989) *Margins of political discourse*. Albany, N. Y.: State University of New York Press.

Gandhi, Collected Works.

Hardiman, D. (2003) *Gandhi in his time and ours: the global legacy of his ideas*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Lal, B. K. (1978) *Contemporary Indian philosophy* [2nd rev. ed.]. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishing.

Parel, A. J. (2007) *Hind Swaraj and other writings.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Parel, A. J. (2006) *Gandhi's Philosophy and the Quest for Harmony*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rudolph, L. I. and Rudolph, S. H. (2006) *Postmodern Gandhi and other essays: Gandhi in the world and at home* [Rev. ed.]. Chicago, London: University of Chicago Press.

www.historymarg.com

Sharma, A. (1982) *The Purusharthas: A Study in Hindu Axiology*. East Lansing, MI: Asian Studies Center, Michigan State University.

Söyler, T. (2009a) *Gandhi and Counter-Enlightenments*. Unpublished M.A. Thesis.

Söyler, T. (2009b) The Simplicity of the Gandhian Discourse in Hind Swaraj (1909) in *Journal of Alternative Perspectives in the Social Sciences*, vol 1, no 3, pp. 938-42.

Terchek, R. (1998) *Gandhi: struggling for autonomy*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Uberoi, J. P. S. (2002) *The European modernity: science, truth and method*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Wakabayashi, J. and Kothari R. (2009) *Decentering translation studies: India and beyond*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Pub. Co.

Yashaschandra, S. (2003) *Literary Cultures in History: Reconstructions from South Asia.* (S. I. Pollock, Ed.) Berkeley, Calif. ; London: University of California Press.

www.historymarg.com

Note

[i] Obama, Barack H. (2009) "Office of the Press Secretary." *The White House*. December 10, 2009. http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-acceptance-nobel-peace-prize (accessed December 23, 2009).

[ii] For example, see Gandhi's comment on World War II to see the obvious contradiction with Obama's approach:

> "Supposing the Allies are victorious, the world will fare no better. They will be more polite but not less ruthless, unless they learn the lesson of non-violence during the war and unless they shed the gains they have made through violence. The first condition of non-violence is justice all round in every department of life. Perhaps it is too much to expect of human nature. I do not, however, think so. No one should dogmatize about the capacity of human nature for degradation or exaltation" (CWMG 78: 180).

[iii] See Serge Halimi's essay for a similar point. http://mondediplo.com/2010/01/01obama

[iv] Gandhi had written *Hind Swaraj* in 1909, between 13 and 22 November on his return trip from England to South Africa. Excerpts of his notes were first published in the Gujarati section of the Indian Opinion. Then, Gandhi personally had translated the book into English with a few revisions. Consequently, the text was published in book form in 1910. In his own translation Gandhi had translated *Hind Swaraj* as *Indian Home Rule*. Although all of my references in this essay are to the English edition of the book, I refer the book as *Hind Swaraj* because of the historical importance of its message and more important than that, the existential connotations of the original title (Söyler, 2009b).

[v] The term *Ahimsa* appears in Hindu teachings as early as the Chandogya Upanishad, where it is listed as one of the five ethical virtues: ahimsa, austerity, almsgiving, uprightness, and truthfulness (Bondurant, 1965: 111). For a good argument about how Gandhi uses *Ahimsa*, see: (Lal, 1978: 108-13).

[vi] In this essay, all of the citations to the Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi (CWMG) are from *the Gandhi Serve* online archives. Reference numbers are given accordingly. Although I am aware of the CWMG Controversy, the parts that I cite are not part of the controversy and I have double checked the citations each time. http://www.gandhiserve.org/cwmg/cwmg.html

[vii] In the following, I will discuss the meanings of the terms *sudharo* and *kudharo* by referring to the most accurate translation, I believe, by Yashaschandra (2003). See also Hardiman (2003: 67-72) and Wakabayashi and Kothari (2009: 116) for more information on the Gujarati concepts.

[viii] All emphases are mine in this paper. Thus, this note should serve as generic reference.

[ix] Through e-mail message to Anthony J. Parel, January 7, 2009.

[x] Although they are not responsible for the ideas I present here, I want to thank Prof. Dr. Boike Rehbein, Prof. Dr. Ari Sitas and Prof. Dr. Anand Kumar for taking my attention to this point.

www.historymarg.com

[xi] I want to thank Dr. Darrin M. McMahon for his remarks on my M. A. thesis and taking my attention to the discussion around Occidentalism.

[xii] Although this is the fact, it is very interesting to observe how some of the Gandhian scholars are excited each time when Obama or other world leaders refer to Gandhi. They tend to forget to ask the question if Gandhi would have taken the honor by such references.

[xiii] Although Gandhi insists that German Jews could have followed a non-violent resistance with a high price to invoke the consciousness of 'ordinary Germans', he thinks even a violent struggle is justifiable in this special case.

> "The German persecution of the Jews seems to have no parallel in history. The tyrants of old never went so mad as Hitler seems to have gone. And he is doing it with religious zeal. For he is propounding a new religion of exclusive and militant nationalism in the name of which any inhumanity becomes an act of humanity to be rewarded here and hereafter. The crime of an obviously mad but intrepid youth is being visited upon his whole race with unbelievable ferocity. If there ever could be a justifiable war in the name of and for humanity, a war against Germany, to prevent the wanton persecution of a whole race, would be completely justified. But I do not believe in any war. A discussion of the pros and cons of such a war is therefore outside my horizon or province. But if there can be no war against Germany, even for such a crime as is being committed against the Jews, surely there can be no alliance with Germany. How can there be alliance between a nation which claims to stand for justice and democracy and one which is the declared enemy of both?" (CWMG 74: 239-40).

[xiv] In a very contradictory way, the simplicity of the Gandhian discourse does not seem to appeal to most of the Gandhian scholars. They tend to write their works in a cryptic manner without letting easy access to their ideas.

[xv] The term "Global South" has a contentious meaning just as the terms "Third World" and "Developing World." All these terms refer to distinctions such as South-North, developing-developed and so forth. There is indeed a problem with dividing the world into different spatial zones according to levels of development. Although there are more neutral terms such as "LACAAP" (Latin America, the Caribbean, Africa, Asia and the Pacific), I used the term "Global South" which is increasingly favored by the scholars (see Chant and Mcllwaine, 2009, Chapter 1 for a discussion of the term). I also want to thank to Nicholas Jepson for raising this point.

[xvi] For Shakira's remarks see the link: http://www.india-server.com/news/shakira-says-she-follows-mahatma-22190.html